

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

In the Notice of Allowance issued June 26, 2009, the Examiner amended claims 1, 2, and 7. The Examiner's amendments to claims 1 and 2 are present in the claims above. Therefore, claims 1-6 should remain allowable for the same reasons for the allowance of those claims in the Notice of Allowance of June 26, 2009.

However, by the present amendment, claim 7 has been amended to change the Examiner's amended language back to the language in its form before the Examiner's Amendment.

Presumably, claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tada (US 2004/0052181). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons.

With respect to the indefiniteness rejection, it is submitted that the amendments to claim 7 in the Amendment filed August 29, 2008, in addition to the remaining Examiner amendment to claim 7, sufficiently address the issues raised by the Examiner and would be clear and definite to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to the prior art rejection, Claim 7 recites a frequency conversion circuit for converting an inputted first cycle binarized wobble signal based on a first optical disc standard into a second cycle binarized wobble signal based on a second optical disc standard. Tada does not disclose this feature. The apparatus of Tada does not convert a first cycle binarized wobble signal based on a first optical disc standard into a second cycle binarized wobble signal based on a second optical disc standard. Rather, Tada merely detects whether the inputted signal is a DVD+RW signal, (i.e., a first optical disc standard), or a DVD-RW signal, (i.e., a second optical disc standard) and selects the corresponding physical address detecting circuit 42 (for DVD+RW (first optical disc standard)) or 44 (for DVD-RW (second optical disc standard))(see, e.g., paragraphs [0043]-[0059]). Note that the conversion here in Tada is not a conversion from DVD+RW to DVD-RW or vice versa, but only a conversion for purposes of detection, i.e., converting the signal to a high/low signal to detect whether the signal is a DVD+RW to DVD-

RW signal. Thus, Tada does not disclose each element recited in claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 is not anticipated by Tada under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-7 are allowable over the prior art of record, and that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyotaka TANAKA et al.

/Jeffrey R. Filipek/

By 2009.09.28 16:11:48 -04'00'

Jeffrey R. Filipek
Registration No. 41,471
Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 28, 2009